

REMARKS

Claims 1-8 are pending in this application. Claims 7 and 8 have been added for the Examiner's consideration. Applicant submits that the subject matter of additional claims 7 and 8 is fully supported by the original written description, including, but not limited to pages 9-16 and FIGs. 3, 6 and 8. Reconsideration of the present application is earnestly solicited.

Priority

Applicant appreciates the Examiner's indication of acceptance of the corresponding Japanese priority document for the present application.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 1-6 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph due to the presence of alleged informalities with the claims. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Specifically, the Examiner has indicated that the phrase "accessing the printing terminal with the user information" is unclear. Applicant submits that one of ordinary skill in the art would readily appreciate the significance of this wording of claims 1 and 4. For example, FIGs. 3, 6 and 8 clearly show this step in the context of the procedures described and shown in connection with these embodiments. The Examiner should appreciate that the term "accessing a terminal" suggests gaining access to the information or capability of the terminal.

As suggested by the Examiner, a user may walk up to a terminal in a store. However, unless the user takes some action to access the information in the terminal, the user will likely be standing in front of the terminal for a very long time without accessing the terminal. Specifically, a user without user information will not have "access" to the terminal. Therefore, in order to access the terminal, e.g., information within the terminal, a user must input user information to identify the user and to identify the information within the terminal that should be accessed specific to the user. Accordingly, claims 1 and 4 do properly recite that the printer terminal is accessed with the user information. Therefore, this rejection should be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-6 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being allegedly anticipated by Fredlund et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,666,215). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Applicant submits that the prior art of record fails to teach or suggest each and every limitation of the unique combination of limitations of the claimed invention. Accordingly, this rejection should be withdrawn.

With respect to claims 1 and 4, Applicant submits that the Examiner has improperly ignored express claim limitations of the method steps of the claims. Applicant submits that the prior art of record fails to teach or suggest each and every limitation of the unique combination of limitations of the claimed invention of claim 1, including the feature(s) of: "an

order terminal installed in the store and connected to the printing terminal by a local network, the print ordering method comprising the steps of outputting an order number corresponding to the order, by using the order terminal.” The claimed order terminal and method is claimed in the context of a store’s order terminal.

With respect to claim 4, Applicant submits that the prior art of record fails to teach or suggest each and every limitation of the unique combination of limitations of the claimed invention, including the feature(s) of: “the order terminal receiving an input of the user information.” The claimed order terminal and method is claimed in the context of a store’s order terminal. Accordingly, this rejection should be withdrawn.

The claimed invention provides a print ordering method/system capable of performing at one location, e.g., a DEP store, the following steps of: inputting user ID, e.g., a DP number and password; digitalizing the photos; ordering film development with prints and storing the data; and ordering reprints. Therefore, according to the method/system, it is easy to manage IDs at DEP stores and it is possible to manage, with using a same ID per a user, image data stored in the database, films, output (printed) images.

Fredlund et al. does not teach or suggest an order terminal installed in a store as claimed. Accordingly, this rejection should be withdrawn.

With respect to claims 2, 3, 5 and 6, the Examiner has not made any attempt to identify these claimed features of the method already positively recited in the independent claims. For example, the use of user information is already positively recited in independent claims 1 and 4, e.g., in the method steps. The dependent claims further

narrow and positively recite what is meant by user information in the alternate claim embodiments set forth in claims 2, 3, 5 and 6.

A DP number preliminarily printed on a DP bag is used at the time of requesting the development and the printing of the film. The film (recording medium capable of reproducing and reading) is in the DP bag. The DP bag has a receipt slip utilized as a bill or a certification for receiving developed and printed films. Further, the user receives the developed and printed films in the DP bag. Fredland et al. do not disclose a DP number preliminarily printed on a DP bag.

The Examiner is apparently suggesting that since claims 2, 3, 5 and 6 begin with the phrase "wherein," the Examiner may simply choose to ignore the claimed limitations. This is improper and unsupported by any section of the MPEP and/or any case decided by the U.S. Patent Office's Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences addressing this issue. Accordingly, the limitations recited therein must be considered by the Examiner. If the Examiner maintains this position in any form, Applicant requests the courtesies of an interview with the Examiner and the Examiner's supervisor.

CONCLUSION

Since the remaining references cited by the Examiner have not been utilized to reject the claims, but merely to show the state-of-the-art, no further comments are deemed necessary with respect thereto.

All the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed and/or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider all presently pending rejections and that they be withdrawn.


It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the Office Action, and that as such, the Examiner is respectfully requested to send the application to Issue.

Applicant respectfully petitions under the provisions of 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a) and § 1.17 for a three-month extension of time in which to respond to the Examiner's Office Action. The Extension of Time Fee in the amount of **\$1020.00** is attached hereto.

In the event there are any matters remaining in this application, the Examiner is invited to contact Marc S. Weiner, Registration No. 32,181 at (703) 205-8000 in the Washington, D.C. area.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

By 
Marc S. Weiner, #32,181

MSW/MTS/cl
2091-0248P

P.O. Box 747
Falls Church, VA 22040-0747
(703) 205-8000